

Docket No.: 50253-034 (P1478)

AF/1 2745/\$  
PATENT

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of

BRUCE TOGNAZZINI

Serial No.: 08/655,133

Filed: May 30, 1996

For: LOCATION/STATUS-ADDRESSED RADIO/RADIOTELEPHONE



Group Art Unit: 2745

Examiner: Edan Orgad

**RECEIVED**

MAR 03 1999

**Group 2700**

**TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF**

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

Submitted herewith in triplicate is Appellant's Appeal Brief in support of the Notice of Appeal filed December 24, 1998. Please charge the Appeal Brief fee of \$300.00 to Deposit Account 500417.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Eugene J. Molinelli".

Eugene J. Molinelli  
Registration No. 42,901

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
(202) 756-8000 EJM:pgb  
**Date: February 23, 1999**  
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087

Docket No.: 50253-034 (P1478)

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of

BRUCE TOGNAZZINI

Serial No.: 08/655,133

Filed: May 30, 1996

For: LOCATION/STATUS-ADDRESSED RADIO/RADIOTELEPHONE



Group Art Unit: 2745

Examiner: Edan Orgad

RECEIVED

MAR 03 1999

Group 2700

APPEAL BRIEF

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

This is an appeal from the Final Rejection of the Examiner dated November 3, 1998. This Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed December 24, 1998.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is SUN MICROSYSTEMS INC. of Mountain View, California.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-10 and 12-26 are pending. Claims 1-26 stand rejected. Claim 11 has been cancelled.

03/01/1999 DVLING 00000021 500417 08655133

01 FC:120 300.00 CH  
This appeal is from the rejection of claims 1-10 and 12-26.

### **STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

No amendments have been filed subsequent to the final Office Action.

### **SUMMARY OF INVENTION**

The invention relates to addressing a communication based on a property stored in a searchable database of the called station rather than on a fixed unique network identification number or telephone number of the called station. The property may be changeable, such as the location of the called station in a moving vehicle, the status of the called station, or the history of the called station. With this arrangement, the called station is addressable based on the location, status or history of the called station and the caller need not know the phone number or unique identification number, that is, the called station is location/status addressable. (Specification, page 5, lines 18-21.)

The information, upon which the decision to connect a call is based, is stored at the called station in a database (specification, page 6, lines 5-6).

This arrangement "permits a wide variety of functionality to be achieved which was not available in the prior art" (specification, page 5, lines 21-23). As indicated in Appellant's response of August 17, 1998, with this invention one may address all stations, even moving vehicles, within three miles of a hazardous materials spill, as determined by the present location of each station stored in the database of that called station and a position criterion based on the spill location included with the calling command, regardless of phone number. As also indicated in that response, one may address just those stations of drivers exceeding 80 mph on highway 101, or just those stations that were within a certain proximity of a crime scene at a certain past time, again, regardless of knowledge of the actual phone number of the called station.

For example, Figure 6A shows part of one record in an exemplary database that stores the information used to determine whether a call will go through. This part of the exemplary record

includes an entry in a column (or field or attribute) called "record type," another entry in a column called "date," another value in a field called "time," another value in an attribute called "location," another entry in an attribute called "orientation" and another value in the column "velocity." As a vehicle with a communication station moves, additional records are added to the data base with new values for, at least, time, location and velocity, and perhaps also orientation or date. Then, for example, if a calling station is addressing vehicles moving more than 80 mph along a stretch of highway 101 at a certain time interval, the calling station sends a query specifying the time interval, speed and locations of interest. In this example, the database can be searched for records with time inside that interval and the location can be checked for falling inside a rectangle defining that stretch of highway 101, and the velocity can be checked for a value greater than 80. Only if a record satisfies all three search criteria will a call be connected to the called station on a vehicle.

The above example shows

a communications request from an originating station which includes a query against information stored at individual stations, receiving a response from only individual stations at which information stored satisfies the query and optionally opening a communications link with individual stations from which a response is received. The query can be against information about location, status or history of individual stations. (Specification, page 7, lines 13-21.)

### ISSUES

The issues on appeal are:

Issue 1: Whether the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-8, 10, 12 and 19-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Lemelson et al., U.S. Patent #5,731,785 (Lemelson).

Issue 2: Whether the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 9 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Lemelson.

Issue 3: Whether the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Lemelson in view of Drori et al., U.S. Patent #5,081,667 (Drori).

### **GROUPING OF CLAIMS**

All claims are argued separately, and each stands or falls independently of any other claim; except, claim 12 stands or falls with claim 10, claim 23 stands or falls with claim 22, and claim 17 stands or falls with claim 16.

### **ARGUMENT**

#### **Issue 1.**

The Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-8, 10, 12 and 19-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Lemelson.

There are significant differences between Lemelson and the claimed invention.

Lemelson shows that a “portable computing and receiving device carried by a person or located (hidden) in an object generates and transmits via radio signals a plurality of codes when remotely activated” (Lemelson, Abstract). The Examiner states that Lemelson shows “[a]t least one called station . . . (figure 3)” (final Office action, page 2). Apparently, the Examiner maps Appellant’s called station to Lemelson’s “remote GPS unit 10” depicted in FIG.3 of Lemelson which “computes the location of such portable device and the person or vehicle carrying the same” (Lemelson, column 3, lines 5-7).

Lemelson also refers to “a standard ID code for a portable unit [which] permits unique identification” (Lemelson, column 4, lines 50-51) and an “inquiry signal particularly identifying the object” (Lemelson, column 8, lines 9-10). Appellant’s background section discloses that “typical radio systems today can . . . target specific vehicles based on their pre-set identity code” (specification page

5, lines 4-6). Neither Lemelson's identification (ID) code nor Lemelson's signal identifying the object is shown by the Examiner to be different than the pre-set network ID code known in the prior art for establishing radio communication between a specific mobile unit and a control center.

Lemelson is directed, e.g., to a way of locating stolen vehicles, by selecting a called station, connecting to the called station (presumably using the prior art unique identifier because no other connection procedure is disclosed), and then receiving current position information from the called station after the connection is established. Specifically, Lemelson states:

The remote unit 10 also communicates via two-way radio links 61 with a monitor control center 35. . . . Coded coordinate indicating signals from the remote unit 10 are received at the monitor control center 35 and indicate the position of the remote unit 10. . . . Other codes transmitted to the monitor control center 35 identify or describe the person or vehicle carrying the remote portable unit. The coded information may be transmitted by satellite or other radio networks such as cellular telephone networks to the monitor station . . . (Lemelson, column 3, lines 8-24).

No unconventional two-way radio connection procedure between the remote unit and the control center is disclosed by Lemelson. Every indication is that the remote unit is called using a conventional connection procedure well known in the art. Lemelson only discloses that, after the connection is made, the remote unit transmits location information to the control center.

Lemelson also discloses a database at a control center where information associated with the called station is stored (Lemelson, column 1, lines 40-49). The control center may also store information about locations, such as a street addresses (Lemelson, column 3, lines 17-20). The central control station then presents information about the called station and its present location. The central control station may retransmit this information (Lemelson, column 3, lines 27-30), for example, to a police car (Lemelson, column 3, line 31).

Lemelson also teaches that "security may be provided in the system . . . using personal identification numbers (PINs)" (Lemelson, column 4, lines 48-49). "Combining the PIN number with

the standard ID code for a portable unit permits unique identification with only authorized access to the portable unit's location" (Lemelson, column 4, lines 49-52).

Lemelson does not teach or suggest basing a connection with a called station on anything different than the conventional calling procedure disclosed in Appellant's background section. Lemelson suggests that after the connection is made, in some embodiments, location information is not transmitted unless an authorized PIN is used.

With respect to independent apparatus claim 1, Appellant recites a "called station" having "a database" and "receiving a communication request including a query specifying at least one criterion for searching said database" and "responding . . . only when said information stored in said database satisfies said . . . criterion." Lemelson does not disclose a database at the called station, or searching such a database, or searching such a database before responding to a communication request, for the reasons given above.

The Examiner asserts that the memory depicted as item 19 of FIG. 3 of Lemelson shows the database (final Office action, page 2). However this item is a memory element where the pre-set ID code is stored, i.e., "an identification code stored in memory at the object, for example generated by a first code generator 18 from associated memory 19" (Lemelson, column 6, lines 13-15). This memory does not function as a database. An associated memory is directly addressed and does not involve retrieving contents from many memory elements at many addresses, and testing each content until a record is found, if any, whose contents satisfies a search criterion in a search query, as is involved in a database search. As is well known, to use associated memory, a program issues a command and specifies the fixed address of the associated memory, and then the contents stored at that address are returned. Contents from multiple memory addresses are not retrieved and checked as in a database search. Therefore the memory of Lemelson does not teach or suggest a database that can be searched.

The Examiner further asserts that Lemelson teaches accessing a database at column 8, lines 22-28 (Office action, page 8). However, the database in the passage cited is “the database at the monitor station” (Lemelson, column 8, line 29) and not one at the vehicle. Thus this passage does not disclose a database searched at the called station as required by claim 1.

The Examiner has not shown where Lemelson searches a database before responding to a request for establishing communications. Only conventional pre-set IDs are suggested for establishing communications in Lemelson, for the reasons given above. Searching a database before connecting a call is not suggested.

Therefore Lemelson does not teach or suggest significant limitations of Appellant’s invention, and a rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is improper. For at least the same reasons, this rejection is improper for claims 2-8 which depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1.

In addition, claim 2 requires “storing current location information in said database” which is not shown by Lemelson because Lemelson does not show a database. Therefore Lemelson does not anticipate claim 2. Claims 3-4 depend on claim 2 and are not anticipated by Lemelson for at least the reasons given for claim 2.

In addition, claim 3 requires “criterion based on location” which is not shown by Lemelson because Lemelson connects based on ID, not based on location; and Lemelson does not have a database that can be searched to match this criterion. Therefore Lemelson does not anticipate claim 3.

In addition, claim 4 requires “a proximity detector” which is not shown by Lemelson. The Examiner asserts that Lemelson teaches a proximity detector but cites a passage that states an object of Lemelson’s invention is “remotely indicating [the object’s] direction, speed of travel and street along which such object is traveling” (Lemelson, column 2, lines 35-37). Lemelson discloses that this is accomplished by storing at the control center the locations from a satellite positioning system sent by

the object, and using the database at the control center which contains information about the location (Lemelson, column 1, lines 62-65, and column 3, lines 17-19), as described above. In Appellant's invention a proximity detector, such as a proximity radar, is a separate device from the global satellite positioning system receiver, such as the GPS receiver (e.g., see Figure 1, items 115 and 110). Thus, Lemelson does not teach or suggest a proximity detector separate from the satellite positioning system. Therefore Lemelson does not anticipate claim

In addition, claim 5 requires "status detector" and "storing . . . status . . . in said database" which is not shown by Lemelson. The Examiner asserts that Lemelson teaches a status detector but cites a passage that states "at the monitor station . . . query a database containing information about various subscribers . . . and . . . display " (column 1, lines 40-46). Information about subscribers is completely different than status of the object or called station. Therefore Lemelson does not teach or suggest status of the object stored at the called station, and thus does not anticipate claim 5. Claim 6 depends on claim 5 and is not anticipated by Lemelson for at least the reasons given for claim 5.

In addition, claim 6 requires "criterion based on status" which is not shown by Lemelson because Lemelson connects based on ID, not on status; and Lemelson does not have a database that can be searched to match this criterion. Therefore Lemelson does not anticipate claim 6.

In addition, claim 7 requires "database stores history" which is not shown by Lemelson because Lemelson does not have a database that is searched before a response, that can contain history information. Therefore Lemelson does not anticipate claim 7. Claim 8 depends on claim 7 and is not anticipated by Lemelson for at least the reasons given for claim 7.

In addition, claim 8 requires "criterion based on history" which is not shown by Lemelson because Lemelson connects based on ID, not based on history; and Lemelson does not have a database that can be searched to match this criterion. Therefore Lemelson does not anticipate claim 8.

With respect to independent apparatus claim 10, Appellant recites a “called station” having “a database” and a “calling station . . . specifying a query for searching . . . said database” and “receiving a response from . . . called stations having information in said database which satisfies said query.” Lemelson does not teach or suggest a database at the called station, searching such a database, or searching the database before responding to connect a call, for the reasons given above for claim 1. Therefore Lemelson does not teach or suggest significant limitations of Appellant’s invention, and a rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is improper. For at least the same reasons, this rejection is improper for claims 11-12 which depend directly from claim 10.

In addition, claim 11 requires “receiving a response from a station having a database . . . which satisfies said query” which is not shown by Lemelson because Lemelson does not have a database at a called station, does not satisfy a query of that database, and does not do so before a receiver receives a response. Therefore Lemelson does not anticipate claim 11.

With respect to independent method claim 19, Appellant recites a “a communication request . . . including a query for searching” and “a response from only individual stations which have information stored that satisfies said query.” Here an originating station is most akin to a calling station and the individual station is most akin to the called station. Lemelson does not disclose searching, or searching before responding to a communication request, for the reasons given above. Therefore Lemelson does not teach or suggest significant limitations of Appellant’s claim 19, and a rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is improper. For at least the same reasons, this rejection is improper for claims 20-21 which depend directly from claim 19.

In addition, claim 20 recites “opening a communication link with individual stations from which a response is received” which is not disclosed by Lemelson. Lemelson does not disclose a

communication link other than the conventional link established using a pre-set ID, not the results of a database search which causes a response. Therefore Lemelson does not anticipate claim 20.

In addition, claim 21 recites “query . . . about location, status or history” which is not shown by Lemelson. Lemelson shows connections based on ID, not based on location, status or history, for the reasons given above. Therefore Lemelson does not anticipate claim 21.

With respect to independent system claim 22, Appellant recites “stations, some of which include a database” and “communication request including a query specifying a criterion” and “a response from stations at which . . . database satisfies said . . . criterion.” Lemelson does not teach or suggest a database at the called station, a query specifying a criterion for searching such a database, or searching the database to satisfy a criterion before responding to connect a call, for the reasons given above for claim 1. Therefore Lemelson does not teach or suggest significant limitations of Appellant’s invention, and a rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is improper. For at least the same reasons, this rejection is improper for claim 23 which depends directly from claim 22.

With respect to independent computer program product claim 24, Appellant recites “a communications request . . . including a query” and “receiving a response from only individual stations . . . [which satisfy] said query.” In the specification, query is always used in a context which involves a search of a database. Since Lemelson does not show a searchable database at the called station for the reasons given above, Lemelson does not teach Appellant’s instructions for satisfying a query of a searchable database before responding to a communications request.

With respect to independent computer program product claim 25, Appellant recites “establishing communications . . . when called station . . . satisfies a search query sent by a calling station.” A search query indicates a searchable database. Since Lemelson does not show a searchable database at the called station for the reasons given above, Lemelson does not teach Appellant’s

instructions for satisfying a search query of a searchable database before establishing communications.

Therefore Lemelson does not teach or suggest significant limitations of Appellant's claim 25, and a rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is improper. For at least the same reasons, this rejection is improper for claim 26 which depends directly from claim 25.

In addition, claim 26 recites "establishing communications . . . when information stored at a called station satisfies a search query" (claim 25) and "said information . . . is location" (claim 26). This limitation is not shown by Lemelson because Lemelson connects based on pre-set ID, not based on location, for the reasons given above for claim 1. Therefore Lemelson does not teach or suggest a significant limitation of claim 26, and a rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is improper.

For the reasons given, the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-8, 10, 12 and 19-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Lemelson should be reversed. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests such action.

## Issue 2.

The Examiner erred in rejecting claims 9 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Lemelson.

For the reasons given above, Lemelson does not teach or suggest establishing a connection between a calling station and a called station using any information other than the pre-set ID known in the prior art. Lemelson does not teach or suggest a searchable database at the called station, searching the database, or searching the database before establishing communications, for example, with a search query in a communication request sent by the calling station and a response to the request from the called station when the database has information that satisfies the search query.

Claim 1 recites a “called station” having “a database” and “receiving a communication request including a query specifying at least one criterion for searching said database” and “responding . . . only when said information stored in said database satisfies said . . . criterion.” Lemelson does not teach or suggest any of these limitations, therefore Lemelson does not render claim 1 obvious. Since claim 9 depends indirectly from claim 1, claim 9 is not rendered obvious by Lemelson for at least the same reasons given for claim 1.

In addition, claim 9 requires “a touch screen display” which is not shown by Lemelson. The Examiner states that it would be obvious to modify Lemelson to include a touch screen display “because touch screen displays are simpler to use, require less physical components and provide a more convenient method for the user to enter data as well as provide a larger screen for viewing” (final Office action, page 4). However the reference itself must provide the motivation to modify the reference to produce Appellant’s invention, and the Examiner has not shown where Lemelson advocates reducing the complexity or number of components in the remote device or increasing the size of the viewing screen. Also, the Examiner has also not shown why a touch screen display necessarily provides a larger screen for viewing than other screens. Therefore the modification proposed by the Examiner is improper, and claim 9 is not rendered obvious by Lemelson.

With respect to independent apparatus claim 10, Appellant recites a “called station” having “a database” and a “calling station . . . specifying a query for searching . . . said database” and “receiving a response from . . . called stations having information in said database which satisfies said query.” Lemelson does not teach or suggest a database at the called station, searching such a database, or searching the database before responding to connect a call, for the reasons given above for claim 1. Therefore Lemelson does not render claim 10 obvious. Since claims 13-15 depend directly or indirectly

from claim 10, claims 13-15 are not rendered obvious by Lemelson for at least the same reasons given for claim 10.

In addition, claim 13 requires a “touch screen display” which is not suggested by Lemelson for the reasons given above for claim 9. Therefore, Lemelson does not render claim 13 obvious.

In addition, claim 14 requires “a touch screen display” which is not suggested by Lemelson for the reasons given above for claim 9, and claim 14 requires “receiving a response from a station having a database . . . which satisfies said query” which is not shown or suggested by Lemelson for the reasons given above for claim 1. The Examiner has failed to show where Lemelson suggest the modifications proposed by the Examiner. Therefore, Lemelson does not render claim 14 obvious.

In addition, claim 15 requires that the calling station “initiates a communications request when . . . a touch screen display . . . is touched” which is not suggested by Lemelson. Lemelson does not suggest the need for a touch screen display for the reasons given above for claim 9. Therefore, Lemelson does not suggest touching a touch screen display. Furthermore, claim 15 requires “touch screen display displaying . . . location of said [called]. . . station” before the “communications request” is initiated, else the request can not be initiated by touching the displayed location. Lemelson does not suggest obtaining locations until after initiating communications using the pre-set ID code, for the reasons given above for claim 1.

For the reasons given, the Examiner’s rejection of claims 9 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Lemelson should be reversed. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests such action.

Issue 3.

The Examiner erred in rejecting claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Lemelson in view of Drori.

Independent claim 16 recites “called station” having “a database” and “receiving a communication request including a query specifying at least one criterion” and “responding . . . when said information stored in said database satisfies said . . . criterion.” Lemelson does not teach or suggest a database at the called station, or searching such a database, or searching such a database before responding to a communication request, for the reasons given above for claim 9.

Drori does not cure the deficiencies in Lemelson. Drori is directed to using a password to access a system. However a password does not imply a searchable database at the called station. Lemelson itself proposes a password, the PIN described above, which, like the pre-set ID is stored in associated memory which is directly addressable. Appellant submits that an associated memory does not teach or suggest a searchable database, any more than a paperback book in one’s jacket pocket suggests a library organized in chronological order by publication date.

Therefore Lemelson does not teach or suggest a significant limitations of Appellant’s claim 16, and a rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is improper. For at least the same reasons, this rejection is improper for claims 17-18 which depends directly from claim 16.

In addition, claim 18 requires “computer activates said hands free telephone” which is not taught in either reference. Therefore the combination does not render claim 18 obvious.

For the reasons given, the Examiner’s rejection of claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Lemelson in view of Drori should be reversed. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests such action.

CONCLUSION

The references cited do not teach or suggest significant limitations of Appellant's invention. Neither the references, nor the combinations and modification suggested therein, provide the functionality and benefits of Appellant's invention as set forth in the specification. In particular, these references do not connect a call to a called station based on the location, status or history of the called station as stored in a searchable database at the called station.

For the reasons cited, Appellants respectfully request reversal of all the Examiner's rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY



Eugene J. Molinelli  
Registration No. 42,901

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
(202) 756-8000 EJM:pgb  
**Date: February 23, 1999**  
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087

**APPENDIX**

1. Apparatus for establishing communications between a calling station and one or more called stations based on information stored at a called station, at least one called station comprising:

- a. a memory storing information in a database;
- b. a receiver for receiving a communications request including a query specifying at least one criterion for searching said database;
- c. a comparator for comparing information stored in said database with said at least one criterion, and
- d. a transmitter for responding to said communications request only when said information stored in said database satisfies said at least one criterion.

2. The apparatus of claim 1, further comprising:

a global positioning satellite receiver for storing current location information in said database.

3. The apparatus of claim 2, in which said communications request includes at least one criterion based on location of said called station with respect to calling station.

4. The apparatus of claim 2, further comprising:

a proximity detector for providing relative location information about nearby objects based on apparatus location, and a computing device for calculating location information independent of said

apparatus location using location information provided by said proximity detector and information provided by said global positioning satellite receiver.

5. The apparatus of claim 1, further comprising:

at least one status detector for storing information about the status of said apparatus in said database.

6. The apparatus of claim 5, in which said communication request includes at least one criterion based on status.

7. The apparatus of claim 1, in which said database stores information about history of said apparatus.

8. The apparatus of claim 7, in which said communications request includes at least one criterion based on history.

9. The apparatus of claim 2 further comprising a touch-screen display which displays current location information in a moving map display.

10. Apparatus for establishing communications between a calling station and one or more called stations based on information stored in a database at a called station, a calling station comprising:

a. an input device for specifying a query for searching information stored in said database at one or more called stations; and

b. a transmitter for broadcasting a communications request including said query; and

c. a receiver for receiving a response from one or more called stations having information in said database which satisfies said query.

11. CANCELLED

12. The apparatus of claim 10, further comprising:

a global positioning satellite receiver for storing current location information.

13. The apparatus of claim 12 further comprising a touch-screen display which displays current location information in a moving map display.

14. The apparatus of claim 10 further comprising:

in which said computer is configured for comparing information stored in said database with said at least one criterion, and for responding to said communications request when said information stored in said database satisfies said at least one criterion.

17. The apparatus of claim 16 installed in a vehicle in which said computer controls vehicle functions and in which an authorized user may preempt control of said vehicle functions over said receiver when said transmitter responds to said communications request.

18. The apparatus of claim 16 installed in a vehicle having a hands free telephone in which said computer activates said hands free telephone under control of a request received over said receiver when said transmitter responds to said communications request.

19. A method for communications, comprising the steps of:

a. providing an element for performing the step of sending a communications request from an originating station including a query for searching information stored at individual stations; and

b. providing an element for performing the step of receiving a response from only individual stations which have information stored that satisfies said query.

20 The method of claim 19, comprising the additional step of:

a receiver for receiving a response from at least one station having a database containing information which satisfies said query, said response including information about the location of said at least one station,

a global positioning satellite receiver for storing location of said apparatus information,

a touch-screen display which displays location of said apparatus information in a moving map display and also information about the location of said at least one station.

15. The apparatus of claim 14, in which said touch screen display initiates a communications request when a location on said touch screen display displaying information about the location of said at least one station is touched.

16. Apparatus for establishing communications between a calling station and one or more called stations based on information stored at a called station, at least one of said one or more called stations comprising:

- a. a computer connected to a bus;
- b. a memory connected to said bus, storing information in a database;
- c. a receiver connected to said bus for receiving a communications request including a query specifying at least one criterion for searching said database; and
- d. a transmitter connected to said bus,

providing an element for performing the step of opening a communications link with individual stations from which a response is received.

21. The method of claim 19 in which said query can be against information about location, status or history of individual stations.

22. A system for communicating between an originating station and one or more called stations, comprising:

- a. a network for connecting stations;
- b. a plurality of stations, at least some of which include a database;
- c. a network channel for sending a communications request including a query specifying at least one criterion from said originating station to all stations and for receiving back a response from those stations at which said information stored in said database satisfies said at least one criterion, and
- d. a network communications channel for communications between said originating station and those stations at which said information stored in said database satisfies said at least one criterion.

23. The system of claim 22 in which said network is a cellular network.

24. A computer program product comprising:

- a. a memory medium, and
- b. a computer program stored on said memory medium, said computer program including:
  - b1. instructions for sending a communications request from an originating station to other stations including a query against information stored at said other stations; and
  - b2. instructions for receiving a response from only individual stations at which information stored satisfies said query.

25. A computer program product comprising:

- a. a memory medium, and
- b. a computer program stored on said memory medium, said computer program including instructions for establishing communications between a calling station and one or more called stations when information stored at a called station satisfies a search query sent by a calling station.

26. The computer program product of claim 25 in which said information stored at a called station is location information and in which said computer program includes instructions for obtaining location information from a plurality of stations and for displaying said location information on a moving map display.